NEW SHAKESPEAREANA.

VOL. VII. JANUARY, 1908. No. 1.

THE "STAR THAT'S WESTWARD FROM THE POLE."

FURTHER EVIDENCE FROM ASTRONOMICAL ALLUSIONS SHOWING THAT THE SECOND QUARTO OF HAMLET WAS WRITTEN IN 1601.

> "Last night of all,
> When yond same star that's westward from the pole
> Has made his course to illume that part of heaven
> Where now it burns, Marcellus and myself,
> The bell then beating one, ———"
>
> Hamlet I. i-36.

In this article I present evidence showing, (1) that the star referred to in the foregoing lines can be identified; (2) that the time of year in which the star was in the position stated can be determined; and (3) that this time of year corroborates the testimony already given in former issues of NEW SHAKESPEAREANA in regard to the date of composition of the second quarto of Hamlet. Moreover, the allusion furnishes an interesting example of the manner in which the movements of the heavenly bodies serve as a guide in determining questions in chronology. In order to make the subject intelligible to readers who may not happen to be familiar with astronomical matters, it is necessary to say a few words upon the dual motion of the stars in the sky. Upon examining the northern heavens on any clear night, at intervals of a few hours, it will be found that the entire sky makes an apparent revolution around a point near the north star, and that this revolution is in a direction the opposite to that in which the hands of a clock move. Thus, the stars above the pole move to the left; those to the left of the pole move downwards, and so on. This well known motion is only apparent, however, and is due, of course, to the earth's rotation on its axis. At the expiration of twenty-four hours the stars will have completed the circle, and will have returned to about the same position they held when first observed. But they do not return to exactly the same position; and this brings us to the con-

sideration of the second apparent motion of the heavens, which, in this instance, is caused by the revolution of the earth around the sun.

Let us suppose an observer to begin his observations at a certain definite hour and date—let us say at ten o'clock P. M. on the first day of January. Let the position from which he makes his observations be fixed and unchanged. And let him determine the exact position of any particular star by referring it to some terrestrial object,—for example, the gable of a house. It will be more convenient if we assume that the star in question is immediately over the north star, and that it, therefore, occupies a position corresponding to the Figure *XII* of a clock dial. On the next evening, on January second, he will find that the star has returned to its place by the house gable, not at ten P. M. but at about four minutes before ten o'clock. To be more exact, it will be there at three minutes and fifty-six seconds before ten. But let us use round numbers and call the interval four minutes. At exactly ten o'clock on January second, therefore, the star will have arrived at and passed, to a slight degree, the gable, or the figure *XII*. Similarly on January the third, the star will be in place at eight minutes before ten, and at ten o'clock will be still further beyond the figure *XII;* and on January fifteenth it will be in its position at one hour before ten, or at nine o'clock; and on February the first will be there at eight P. M.; and at ten o'clock February first will be found to have advanced during the month to such an extent that it now occupies the position corresponding to the Figure *XI* on the dial. In like manner, after an interval of three months, on April first, at ten P. M. the star will be at the Figure *IX* or to the left of the pole; after six months at the Figure *VI*, or under the pole; after nine months at *III;* and on the following January first, it will have completed its circle and will be found once more at its old position by the house gable, or at Figure *XII*—all observations being made at ten o'clock P. M. It follows, from all of this, that any particular star, at a given hour, can occupy a certain position on one day, *and on one day only*, during the year. Therefore, if we know the star referred to, if we know its position in the sky, and if we know the hour, we shall be able to calculate the date; or, rather, the time of years on which the reference to the star was made. In the passage in Hamlet we know the position occupied: "Westward from the pole," or to the left of the pole star. We know also the hour: "The bell then beating one." Problem: Find the date or time of year.

But, before we can solve this problem, it is necessary to identify the star referred to. And here we meet with the difficulty that has prevented all commentators from giving to this passage a correct interpretation. For,

upon examining the northern heavens, we find that there is no bright particular star that excels the others in glory; nor is there any star in the neighborhood of the pole, that is, from its isolated position, in any way conspicuous. In the northern sky we find the well known constellation Ursa Major, or as it is better known in this country, the Dipper. On the opposite side of the pole is Cassiopeia. There are the Little Bear, the Dragon, and other minor constellations. But not a single one of any of the circumpolar constellations contains a star brighter than the second magnitude. It results, therefore, that we must concentrate our attention upon the word "star"; else, in default of any other solution, the problem becomes hopeless. I have been able to find two instances in Elizabethan literature in which this word is used in a peculiar sense; and both of these, published within fifteen years of the date of writing the second quarto, throw light on the Hamlet passage. In Grosart's "Life and Works of Robert Greene" Vol. *III,* there is published a tale called "Morando, The Tritameron of Love". On page 79 occurs the following sentence: "The starre Cassiopeia remaineth in one signe but ten daies, and thou in one mind but ten howers". It is evident that the word "star" is here used as an equivalent to our word "constellation". Again, in the old drama "The Misfortunes of Arthur", there occur the following lines:

"The whiles, O Cassiopoea, gem bright signe, Most sacred sight, and sweet coelestiall starre, This clymat's joy &c. (*I.* i.)

Here, again, "star" means "constellation". We must therefore read the lines from Hamlet as meaning "When yond same constellation that's westward from the pole" etc.

Now it is an interesting fact, and one that may be more than a coincidence, that this same constellation Cassiopeia, is westward from the pole at one o'clock A. M. during the second week in December. It should be explained that the dramatist did not use the word "westward" in the modern technical astronomical sense of the word. What he undoubtedly meant was that Cassiopeia occupied a position corresponding to the Figure *IX* on the clock; or, in other words, that it was horizontally to the left of the pole star. For reasons not necessary to give here, the position occupied by Cassiopeia varies slightly with the geographical latitude of the observer, when the word "westward" is used in the popular sense in which it is used in the Hamlet passage. But the difference is but little. It is sufficient to say that, when viewed from a point of latitude forty degrees north, Cassiopeia is at the present time, horizontly to the left of the pole star at one A. M. about the middle of December. This can readily be verified by any one. In the latitude of London the date is several days earlier. Cassiopeia is a con-

stellation that can easily be identified. At the date and hour mentioned it is to the westward of the pole star. The five brightest stars have, roughly, the shape of the letter *W* which, then, is standing on its side, with what is ordinarily the top of the *W* turned toward the pole star. At the time of Elizabeth, however, the constellation reached the above position at an earlier date. We must subtract, first, ten days, in order to convert New Style to Old Style. And, secondly, we must subtract four days more, on account of what is known as the precession of the equinoxes. Deducting these fourteen days, we obtain, as an astronomical fact, the closing days of the month of November, Old Style, for the date at which Cassiopeia was westward from the pole at one o'clock A. M. as seen from London in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Let us see what limits must be placed to the accuracy of this calculation. Let us take an extreme case, and see at what date the constellation, instead of being westward from the pole, at Figure *IX* of the clock, would be under the pole and at Figure *VI* of the clock. I trust, from what I have said at the beginning of this article regarding the celestial motions, that it will readily be understood that at one o'clock A. M. we shall find Cassiopeia under the pole some three months after the end of November, viz.: in the latter part of February. It would then be at what we have called *VI* of the dial. Similarly, at the end of January, it would be at *VII* of the dial; and, at the end of December, at *VIII* of the dial. So that, at only thirty days after the end of November, the constellation would be displaced to a very perceptible extent from the position in the sky occupied in November. It would, in fact, be downward in the sky about thirty degrees.

But here another point must be considered. From a careful reading of the Hamlet passage it is evident that we are not at liberty to decide that Cassiopeia was exactly at the Figure *IX* when Bernardo pointed to it. For his words tell us that, although in the main westward from the pole, the "star" had "made his course to illume that part of heaven where now it burns". In other words, it had passed, to some extent, the Figure *IX*. This would throw the date into some time in the month of December. I think we are justified in concluding, however, that the date was not later than December; for, as we have just seen, Cassiopeia, in that event would have moved downward in the sky to too great an extent to allow its position to be described as "westward" from the pole. Cassiopeia is the only constellation that is at all conspicuous in this part of the sky. But I would by no means have it supposed that this fact is the only reason for the conclusion we have arrived at: that the star in question was Cassiopeia. This conclusion is based

upon the corroborating evidence already presented (in January and April, 1907, p. p. ll. 65 and 72 in NEW SHAKESPEAREANA) showing that the second quarto of Hamlet was written in November-December, 1601. In recapitulating these, I shall not include the meteroic shower due to have occurred on Oct. 27th, 1601; for, although a shower of falling stars actually was seen in China in 1602, I have not been able to discover any corroborating evidence to show that that shower was seen in England in 1601. Briefly our evidence is as follows: (all dates Old Style.)

(1) The passage in Hamlet: (*I.* i. 159.) the season "wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated";—(December, of course.)

(2) The travelling of the players:—in the autumn of 1601.

(3) The eclipse of the moon (Hamlet *I.* i. 118-120) November 29. 1601.

(4) The eclipse of the Sun (Ibid *I.* i. 118.) December 14th, 1601.

(5) The "Some two month's since here was . . . . Lamond". (Ibid *IV.* vii. 82-94.) As I have shown, this refers to the embassy of the Duc de Biron to England in September, 1601; and the "some two month's since", carries the date forward into the months of November-December, 1601. The Cassiopeia allusion, therefore, supports, and is supported by, these five points of evidence.

HENRY PEMBERTON, JR.

THE OLD BLACKFRIARS THEATRE. A FRESH DISCOVERY OF DOCUMENTS.

[Reprinted from the London Times of September 11th, 1906. Professor Wallace has at present in preparation a three volume work upon the subject matters of this article which will contain not only much new matter in the way of historical and biographical discovery, but present fac similies of hitherto unsuspected documentary evidence touching many Shakespearean propositions.]

Next to the interest in Shakespeare is the interest in the theatres of his time. Instead of lessening, these interests grow more and more intense with the increase of years. So popular have they become that within the last few years certain theatres have been specially fitted out in Germany, America, and England—notably in Munich, Harvard Uni-

versity, Chicago, and London—for the purpose of exactly reproducing the Elizabethan stage and drama. Certain features of these attempts I shall discuss later.

In October, 1905, I was able to announce the discovery of three theretofore unkonwn documents touching a chancery suit in which Shakespeare was involved as one of the plaintiffs in the last year of his life, 1615. These documents have been widely reprinted and reviewed in England, America, and Germany, being regarded by many as the most interesting, if not the most valuable, Shakespearian discovery since the days of Malone, more than 100 years ago—an enthusiastic opinion in which, however, I cannot fully agree. This discovery has also been chief in arousing large hopes and widespread interest in extensive Shakespearian investigations for the future among the national records, where these documents had for 300 years lain buried. While these three records because of the name of Shakespeare have a curious interest and some value, they are far from being either the most interesting or the most important that I have assembled from English, French, and German archives contributory to knowledge of the Elizabethan-Jacobean drama and stage. The chief of these I cannot report upon in a newspaper article, and must ask that their publication and an adequate discussion of their relations be awaited with more or less patience until the issue of a work I am now preparing, which deals in particular with the Children companies and their dramas at Blackfriars and Whitefriars theatres, and in general with the entire theatrical *status* during the last ten years of Shakespeare's life. At this time I desire to present only certain matters of general interest touching the famous old Blackfriars Theatre which in the above period stood on a part of the present site of The Times buildings.

The occasion of the present article is the recent discovery of four additional ancient suits at law in the Public Record Office, Chancery-lane, aggregating about ten thousand words, and furnishing fresh and valuable information on the size and structure of Blackfriars Theatre, and the conduct of plays there from late Elizabeth to King James's suppression of the Children's company in 1608. The nature and value of these suits as literary-historical material can be only very generally indicated here, and seems best reached by a brief survey of the history of the theatre. The long prevalent erroneous belief that Shakespeare was connected with the Blackfriars from its foundation to his death roused a century of antiquarian interest in the ancient monastery to which it once belonged as a priory building. Its monastic history has consequently been stated

again and again, while the erronous notions concerning it as a theatre permeate the thousands of critical and commentarial writings of the past hundred years touching the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama. Chief among the propagators of these errors was the late Mr. J. Payne Collier, who devoted the major part of his 90 years to the Shakespearian drama and stage. Not content with the theories of his predecessors nor with his own, he deliberately destroyed numerous public records that apparently contradicted his theories, and also forged, more or less skilfully, numerous others to support his position. Most of these forgeries have to do with Shakespeare and his company as being at Blackfriars, while one connects him with the Children actors at Whitefriars. For 30 years these brazen forgeries passed unchallenged. Not only that. They were accepted by the entire world of literary scholars and were written into literary histories as important contributions, where they still continue to work pestilentially. Finally on July 2 and 16, 1859, Mr. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, of the British Museum, in articles to The Times, showed the ungenuineness of certain of the Collier documents. This article led to others, and then to scientific investigations and a long controversy extending over many years, ultimately establishing the charge of forgery in a large number of documents published by Collier. The discovery of the Blackfriars Sharepapers of 1635 by J. O. Halliwell in 1870 clinched the proof of forgery in certain documents Collier had so long fooled the world with. All but one of the forged Blackfriars documents have long been exposed. To this particular remaining one I shall later have to be undertaker. After the above exposures, interest in the Blackfriars died down, and the Globe, as Shakespeare's theatre, drew almost exclusive attention upon itself. Blackfriars came into partial possession of its historical rights through the discovery of important documents in 1885-1889 by the late Mr. James Greenstreet. Its true history, however, has never yet been published. The documents that I shall later present and discuss show to my surprise that Blackfriars was the most famous theatre of its time, and that it is historically the most important structure in early English stage history—not because of Shakespeare's later connexion with it, but for very different reasons hitherto unguessed.

The truth concerning Blackfriars for the first 12 years after Burbage's purchase of the building in 1596 and remodelling of it into a theatre is interwoven with the history of the Boys who held its boards. Its earlier history is connected with monastic annals, and may here be briefly summarized.

The monastery that has left its name in "Blackfriars-road," "Blackfriars-pier," "Blackfriars-bridge," &c., was established about 1270-75, and closed its career in the general dissolution of the religious orders by Henry VIII., into whose possession it was surrendered November 10, 1539. The property was just without the walls of the City of London, on the high north bank of the Thames and east of what is now called New Bridge-street. It included the little church of St. Anne's, numerous shops and dwellings, the splendid conventual church 220 feet long by 66 feet wide, a churchyard on the north 200 feet by 90 feet, the cloisters on the south, comprised in a square of 110 feet, and to the west of these the little chapter-house and large priory buildings, one of which, standing on the site of the present Publishing Office of The Times and opening on what is still called Playhouse-yard, became the Blackfriars Theatre in 1597. Soon after Edward VI.'s accession he put this particular priory building to a new use. He had all the apparel and furniture for the revels and masques at Court removed to it from Warwick Inn. Here also was the office of Sir Thomas Cawarden, the first Master of the Revels, who rehearsed in the great hall companies of actors in masques and interludes or plays chiefly for performance of Court. After thus using the building for three years, King Edward VI. made Sir Thomas Cawarden a present of the entire Blackfriars precincts not already given to other favouries—the two churches, the cloisters, the priory houses, shops, residences, and lands—by letters patent dated at Westminster, March 12, 1550. Cawarden proceeded to make changes in the precinct. One of his first acts was to demolish the fine old conventual church as well as the little church of St. Anne's. He seems to have planned to make his acquisition the aristocratic residence quarter for nobles and lords. But apparently he made no material changes in this particular priory building besides using it for a few years for theatrical performances, and later converting it into residence flats. The site of the Blackfriars Priory-Theatre building is well known and easily reached. If you come down Fleet street, turn to the right at Ludgate-circus and go down New Bridge street. Just before reaching Blackfriars-bridge turn left into Queen Victoria-street. A few steps take you to Water-lane, along which runs the elevated South-Eastern and Chatham Railway. Go north on Water-lane seventy-five paces and you reach at your right "Playhouse-yard," the name given to the little passage in memory of Blackfriars Theatre. It is an irregular way used by foot passengers. With a width of about thirty feet, it runs east about ninety feet against a building which occupies probably the site

of the old "Pipe Office," adjoining the entrance to The Times Publishing Office—approximately the site of the north entrance to the Blackfriars Theatre. Here the passage jogs to the left, runs with a width of about twelve feet for a distance of ninety feet further, when it again jogs off to the left and becomes Glasshouse-yard, so named from the glass factory that stood here near the theatre. This in turn, a few steps further on, is continued as Ireland-yard, which was probably the north boundary of the property Shakespeare purchased here in 1613, and takes its name from William Ireland, who then occupied the house. Within the fifty years after Cawarden's acquisition of the precinct, the immediate environs of the Blackfriars Theatre, then in the bloom of its youth, had become one of the most aristocratic residental districts. Henry Lord Hunsdon, the Queen's Chamberlain of the Household, had his mansion here. His son, Sir George Carey, who, upon the death of his father in 1596, succeeded to the title of Lord Hunsdon, and in the following year became Lord Chamberlain, had his residence adjoining the south wall of the theatre. The gate to his mansion adjoined the south entrance to the theatre, and both opened out of the same passage-way. Sir William More of Losely owned a house in Playhouse-yard (then called Pipe Office-yard) almost opposite the theatre on the north. It was occupied by Lord Cobham, who, during a part of the first year of the theatre's history, was Lord Chamberlain. Elizabeth, Dowager Lady Russell, resided near. According to the petition of the inhabitants of the Blackfriars precincts in 1596 to stop the conversion of the priory building into a theatre by James Burbage, there were others of the nobility in the neighborhood. The deed of Henry Walker to William Shakespeare in 1613 shows that formerly John Fortescue had lived in that house, and at present Henry Earl of Northumberland occupied adjoining property. The Blackwells and the Bacons, families of wealth and position, lived near. The Chancery documents concerning Shakespeare and others in 1615 which I published last year as noted above, give the names of others, particularly Sir Thomas Bendish, Robert Dormer, and additional members of the Blackwell and Bacon families. Unpublished documents that I have come upon in the Guildhall archives indicate that most of the inhabitants of Blackfriars precinct were not of the wealthy class. The aristocratic part was limited practically to the district formerly occupied by the cloisters, the pretentious priory buildings, and the demolished conventual church.

The Blackfriars Theatre stood in the midst of this aristocratic district. It was a much more pretentious structure than usually supposed.

The fact that James Burbage (who purchased the house, February 4, 1596, of Sir Thomas Cawarden's executor, Sir William More of Losely) paid £600 for it—about £4,800 in present money on the most conservative estimate—indicates that it was of considerable size. Compare this with the price of the best known property in the district, Shakespeare's house. This was a dwelling of at least two storeys, with several rooms, and cost only £140 at its purchase by the poet in 1613. The natural inference that the priory house, purchased by Burbage and converted into the Blackfriars Theatre, must have been four to five times as large is borne out by present available *data* in the documents just discovered. A further notion of the pretentiousness of the structure may be reached by a comparison of total costs of contemporary theatres—"The Theatre" (1576-1598), £600; the Globe (1598-1613), built partly of the old materials of the torn down "Theatre," approximately the same or less; the Fortune (1600), £520 plus £200 for lease of grounds. Allowing a minimum of £200 for the extensive remodelling of the priory into the Blackfriars Theatre, its total cost amounts to £800. The Blackfriars, then, was the most expensive theatre ever built in London prior to 1614, in which year the Globe (burnt down June 29, 1613), was rebuilt at an outlay of £1,400. From the evidence of documents now available, it is possible for an architect to reproduce the general structure and many details of both the exterior and interior of the Blackfriars Theatre. The building was a stone structure erected in two sections. One section adjoined the Pipe Office, the place where the rolls of State parchments large as drainpipes were kept. It was full two storeys high, with dormer windows in the third storey and a garret above. The roof was steep, with gable-end facing north on Pipe-Office-yard (now Playhouse-yard). The number, location, and use of the various rooms in this section is given by different documents. The main section containing the auditorium and stage of the theatre was on the south. This section was two storeys high, and had originally a low or flat roof. But Burbage in remodelling it changed the shape of the roof, and built certain rooms above the great hall. There were also "cellar" or basement rooms which were used for apartments. The auditorium proper occupied about half of the available space of the building.

Since Wright's Historia Historionica (1699), it has generally been assumed that Blackfriars was very small. He says, also, that the Cockpit (built by the way about 1610 instead of 1616-17 as usually believed, on the site of the Drury Lane Theatre) and Salisbury Court (1629) were almost of the same size and form as Blackfriars. The value of the present

discoveries in settling the question of size here raised must be shown later, when I can present all details in full. Although exact dimensions are now available, perhaps the general reader may get the most adequate notion from the fact that the square dimensions were about half those of the old Globe or the Fortune, with a seating capacity in pit, galleries, and private boxes of approximately five hundred. It was the most fashionable and aristocratic theatre of London, and was attended by the London élite, lords and ladies, as also by Queen Elizabeth and her court. It was large enough for the Burbage Shakespeare Company before 1612 to gain in one winter there more by £1,000 than they were used to do at the Globe. But this was due mainly to the high prices and superior accommodations at Blackfriars in catering to the fashionable set.

A summarizing word as to the newly discovered documents, several items of which I have made use of in the foregoing. The most valuable records touching Blackfriars Theatre and its conduct hitherto known are those already mentioned as discovered by Mr. Greenstreet in 1885-1889. These are mainly suits in Chancery, preserved at the Public Record Office, where they have long been conveniently indexed. Mr. Greenstreet himself, who was not a literary specialist, though a constant record-searcher, wondered why no one had thought before to look into the index. The four suits that I have recently discovered are also in the Public Record Office. But they are among the million or more of unindexed records. I have eventually reached them only after long research. Among the numerous items covered by their combined 10,000 words are these:—The dated articles of agreement under which the Children's company was conducted until its termination in 1608; two dated bonds binding the parties of the company to payment of specified sums in case of failure to carry out certain agreements; the exact dimensions of the Blackfriars auditorium; the location of the stage; the existence of galleries, together with numerous details concerning the uses to which other rooms were put, and general items on the conduct of the theatre. These documents are in the same category with the Greenstreet discoveries, and can hardly be said to be either more valuable or less valuable. I regard both sets as among the most important records touching the history of the drama and stage in the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean period—the period at which the drama, with Shakespeare its leading figure, reached the highest point of art in the world's history.

I shall later publish the documents in extenso, with ample details of their relations and significance.

Charles William Wallace.

MARGINALIA

HAMLET IN HINDUSTAN. THE NEW YORK DRAMATIC MIRROR prints an interesting bill of "the much appreciated opera, Hamlet, or Khoon-Nauch," as performed in that part of India by natives, under command of His Highness the Maharajah of Travancore. The bill is printed both in English and in Hindustani, and declares that the play employs "seventy-five talented actors who have traveled all over India, Burma, the Straits Settlements and Ceylon with unprecedented success".

The Bill announces that the performers enact the play "with marvelous scenes and delightful dresses of the latest Paris design," and in Hindustani, and the Mirror's correspondent notes that Hamlet wore tan shoes. The curtain rises with the king and the queen in the garden. This gives what Shakespeare does not, a glimpse of Hamlet's father in the flesh. The king's brother, Furrokh, poisons the king for love of the queen, "and after satisfying the public as to the cause of the king's death, and after remarriage of the queen with himself, with the help of the minister, ascends the throne." But the dead king's son, Jehangir (Hamlet), suspects the foul play and resolves to revenge the wrong.

In the second scene Furrokh and Maleka, the queen, are seen making love. Furrokh is in great anxiety about his nephew, Jehangir, the rightful heir to the throne, "and is consequently restless and miserable." Queen Maleka, however, reassures him. She will bribe the Vazier, (Polonius), and through his instrumentality pacify Prince Jehangir. Jehangir, however, through his suspicion, is driven mad, and Maharbanu (Ophelia), the daughter of the Vazier, who is in love with him, is greatly grieved thereat. Jehangir, in his madness and suspicion, treats Maharbanu's love with contempt. A diversion is created here by an addition to Shakespeare. Sulyman, a negro servant of Prince Jehangir, is in love with one of the maids of Maharbanu, and is seen flirting with her. And Mansoor, a nobleman in love with Maharbanu, courts her and is rejected, and made fun of by some maids, one of whom, eventually sympathizing, consents to allow him admission into the garden during Maharbanu's presence there. Sulyman, also admitted to the garden, advises Maharbanu to marry one of her maids to a magician, by whose services she may regain the prince's love; and asked as to the identity of the magician, puts himself forward as the wonder worker.

Jehangir, roaming about, meets the ghost of his father, is fully informed of the latter's murder, and determines to avenge him. Maharbanu is being entertained by her maids with singing and dancing when Mansoor enters, pleads for her hand, is rejected and departs vowing vengeance. Jehangir enters, and meets a loving greeting from Maharbanu with a tirade on womankind. Sulyman, dressed as a bridegroom, is seen waiting for the maid promised him in marriage. She appears with an old lover, who beats Sulyman. Enter Monsoor, who bribes Sulyman to murder Jehangir; but Sulyman later declines to do this. Now occurs a more familiar scene. "Furrokh begs of the Vazier to talk to Prince Jehangir and console him. Jehangir receives the Vazier with showers of abuse and aversion, so Malkka, his mother, is sent to him. She is treated the same way, and as Jehangir moves to punish her the old Vazier rushes in and interferes and Jehangir kills him on the spot, and would kill his mother also, but his father's ghost appears and prevents him."

In the next scene Sulyman tells Maharbanu that the prince wishes to see her alone in a secluded place, where instead she finds Mansoor, who, when she rejects him, attacks her. Jehargir appears, shoots Mansoor, and after receiving Maharbanu's thanks tells her he has killed her father, the old Vazier. The girl faints, and in the next scene is discovered in madness walking on the bank of a river into which she falls by accident and is drowned.

Now appears the girl's brother, Nazir, who swears to avenge the death of his father and sister on Jehangir. He plots with the king, who suggests that he shall kill the prince upon the slightest provocation, and furnishes him with a poisoned sword. Here comes the last scene, which introduces the play to catch the conscience of the king, and the deaths of the various personages are achieved practically as in the original, except that Jehangir uses a pistol to kill his uncle.

* * *

I'LL TELL IT" CRIED SMELLFUNGUS "TO THE WORLD." "YOU HAD BETTER, said I, "tell it to your physician." Cabling across the Atlantic being comparatively inexpensive we had the announcement last fall that a German phenomenon named Bleibtreu had discovered that Rutland wrote Shakespeare. With barely a year to digest this find, another cable announces that a patient Willisden schoolmaster, named Nichol (which of course is important), learns that the real author of the plays and poems was Henry Wriothlesey, third Earl of Southampton. Mr. Nicoll, in the course of two years' deciphering the first folio edition of Shakespeare's works, found the initials "H. W." written on every page. He found, too, that when the plays were placed in

their proper order they gave the name of the real author and a key to the dates at which the plays were written. In the cipher William Shakespeare, an actor, who was befriended by the Earl, is described as a rogue and a Jew. He bought his house at Stratford-on-Avon with money given to him by the Earl for another purpose. The manuscript of these plays and poems were buried on the seashore, within sight of one of the Earl of Southampton's domains. The twelfth proposition of Euclid is mentioned as the key to the situation, and the exact place is located from a church steeple nearby, except that the ms. of Romeo and Juliet was buried in a tomb in Dulwich, and that the Earl feared the discovery of his secret when King James had the gates of the tomb renewed. Southampton had previously used the name of Marlowe from the age of fourteen up to Marlowe's death. As usual Herr Nichol intends to complete the work of unraveling the cipher in the plays which tells all this, and will make a book about it. The motto of the book will perhaps be taken from Laurence Stern, as above quoted. Meanwhile, it would save twenty-third century readers a lot of literature if Mr. Pinero or Mr. Shaw would state in print where the mss. of their plays were to be buried. For mankind is mortal, and the labour of cipherists sometimes interrupted. Mr. Donnelly, for instance, left this advertisement unfulfilled at his untimely death: "In press, Ben Jonson's Cipher" by Ignatius Donnelly. "But now 'tis odds beyond arithmetic."—*Coriolanus, III. I.* In this work, which will be published in two or three months, Mr. Donnelly seeks to demonstrate:

1. That there is a cipher in the so-called Ben Jonson Plays.
2. That they were written by Francis Bacon.
3. That the internal story refers to the important events of that era—as the astronomical discoveries of Gallileo; the poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury in the Tower, by the Earl and Countess of Somerset; the massacre of Saint Bartholomew; the first establishment of newspapers in England; the settlement of Virginia and the marriage of Pocahontas; the founding of the Rosicrucian Society; the writing of "Don Quixote," with a biography of the supposed author, Cervantes; Shakspere's application for a coat of arms for his father; with many references to Marlowe, Montaigne, etc., etc.

The price will probably be $1.25 per volume, in cloth. Orders filled in the order in which they are received. Address, The Verulam Publishing Company, Room 632 Boston Block, Minneapolis, Minn."

* * *

A COPY OF THE FOLLOWING CORRESPONDENCE HAS BEEN FURNISHED US.

Herr Dr. H. R. D. Anders. Honored Sir—In your distinguished work

"Shakespeare's Books", published in 1904 under the auspices of The German Shakespeare Society, you demonstrate that in Shakespeare's Plays there are plausible or probable traces of William Shakespeare having read in whole or in part, about three hundred authors or particular works; contemporary or classic, specifying such authors or particular works by name.

On page 108 of that work, you say, however, "I have not been able to discover any traces of Bacon in Shakespeare's works". This statement might merely indicate your personal inability to pronounce that a similarity or even an identity of phrase or sentiment in the plays coincidentally with some other work, was a "trace"—or were "traces" of the author named were it not that you append to this statement a foot-note, to wit "From the Baconians we learn how *not* to reason. This is some good, though a negative one."

It is this foot-note, Herr Dr. Anders, which has thrown the doubt upon your meaning, which leads us to make a proposition to which I hope it will not ennui you to give some consideration. For if this foot-note means that you have familiarized yourself with the Baconian literature—in the course of which hundreds, perhaps thousands, of "parallelisms" between Bacon and Shakespeare are cited—verb. lit. et punct., then your statement in your text means that you have found every one of these "parallelisms" specious, spurious, vicious, and apparent only. If this is what you have found, Sir, then you have found exactly what the reasoning and thinking world want to know, and hear about. And it would be a great condescension to the Shakespeare student, who finds his studies disarranged and his preconceptions disturbed by a persistent and annoying Baconian-Authorship Theory, if you would elaborate with the weight of your authority and exact scholarship, the propositions which inferentially you italicise in your Book, to wit, that there is no single trace in Shakespeare's plays of anything ever written or uttered by Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor Bacon Verulam, Marquis St. Albans, etc., etc., etc.

In January, 1900, there was arranged in Philadelphia, United States, a debate between believers in the Shakespeare authorship of the plays and believers in the Baconian authorship, and the contestants agreed upon two debaters—Dr. Appleton Morgan of New York City, President of the New York Shakespeare Society for the Shakespearean Authorship, and Dr. Isaac Hull Platt for the Baconian Authorship. Surely neither side could complain of that assignment, either for the scholarship or the forsenic training and ability, not to say, agility, of the debaters. And as to loyalty, each to his own side,— Dr. Morgan, besides being a prominent lawyer of forty years practice in the City of New York, was President of a renowned and learned

Society that has added many scores of invaluable works to our libraries of exact Shakespeareana; while Dr. Platt has been for twenty years a sturdy protagonist of the Stratford Authorship, and a mainstay of Baconians all over the world, and could be depended on to yield no ground to Dr. Morgan's onslaughts, or be betrayed into no concessions by Dr. Morgan's finesse. The debate was a long and elaborate one. The stenographic report of it consumes seventy-seven royal octavo pages of the issue of NEW SHAKESPEAREANA for April-July, 1903. At a certain point in this most thorough, searching and elaborate debate, Dr. Platt, for the Baconians, suggests a Protocol. This was further debated, and finally Dr. Morgan suggested an amended Protocol—and this (with but one modification from Dr. Platt) was adopted. The third article of that protocol so mathematically and exactly reverses your statement quoted above that I am calling your attention to this Protocol, which I give in full in order to preserve the context, placing the article which totally disagress with your statement, in small capitals—to wit.

PROTOCOL.

(I) The plays known as Shakespeares were produced in London as William Shakespeare's between the years 1584 and 1616, and were repeatedly printed and reprinted as his in quarto, without cavil or demurer from any except perhaps Richard Greene and perhaps a few other rival play-wrights.

(II) As they stand in the First Folio, the Shakespeare plays are the product of either the growth or the augmentation by their author or authors, of these quarto versions, and contain thousands of eloquent lines, and twelve out of sixteen entire plays; which, so far as any record can be discovered, never saw the light in Shakespeares life time or until seven years after in death,

(III) THERE ARE SO MANY THOUSANDS OF IDENTITIES OF THOUGHT, PHRASE, PHRASEOLOGY, OPINION, CIRCUMSTANTIAL STATEMENT, ERROR AND CORRECTION OF ERROR IN THE LITERATURES WE CALL RESPECTIVELY "SHAKESPEARE" AND "BACON", AND SO MANY CO-INCIDENCES BETWEEN BACON'S KNOWN DOINGS, CIRCUMSTANCES AND STUDIES AND THE MATERIAL OF CERTAIN OF THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS —THAT IT IS A WELL-NIGH SUCCESSFUL DEMONSTRATION THAT BACON HAD MORE OR LESS TO DO WITH THE FIRST FOLIO EDITION OF THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS.

(IV) The Baconian Theory so called, has arrived at a point

where it cannot be safely ignored. It is "a monster of such frightful mien as to be hated needs but to be seen, but seen too oft, familiar with its face, we first endure, then pity, then embrace!" The only safety is to look the other way, or to say "There is absolutely nothing in it."

(V) The spirit of the whole series of the plays is dominated by one man, though this man might have had, and probably did have, helpers and co-adjutors.

This protocol, or agreement or settlement (as far as it doubtless can ever be settled,' Dr. Morgan for the Shakespearean and Dr. Platt signed.

Certainly, even without your foot-note, your statement "that you have not been able to discover any traces of Bacon in Shakespeare's works—even if merely be the statement of your personal inability in view of your noble volume of three hundred royal octavo pages (whose index alone consumes twenty-three double columned pages of fine print, and which mentions thousands of authors and separate pieces which Shakespeare more or less follows, copies or paraphrases,—taken together with this third Article of the Morgan-Platt proctocol seems to call for collation or reconciliation!

Would it not be a contribution to the final settlement of this vexed and most important literary question, (for certainly a question as to the authorship of the most magnificent literature in the world cannot be unimportant to the least of us) if, as I now respectively suggest, you collect and frame specifications, under your propositions, or claim or thesis that there are no traces of Bacon in the Shakespeare Plays and Poems?

And if you should be pleased to require a vehicle for the publication of these specifications, I beg to herewith tender you the hospitality of the pages of NEW SHAKESPEAREANA.

Trusting that you will be able to comply at no distant date, with this suggestion, and assuring you of the great interest in this matter which exists throughout the United States as well as throughout Germany and (though perhaps in a lesser degree than in Germany) in England, and promising you a wide and distinguished circulation among scholarly, discriminating and thoughtful men and women, (for only to such does NEW SHAKESPEAREANA go) and stipulating to even circulate extra copies if it so pleases you express a desire.

Believe me Sir, with great respect,
Your obedient servant
B. FRANK CARPENTER.

Editor NEW SHAKESPEAREANA. Westfield. Union County, New Jersey, U. S. A. October 15th, 1907.

University of Gretfswald, Germany, October 25th, 1907. B. Frank Carpenter, Esq., Co-Editor of NEW SHAKESPEAREANA, Sir: * * * *

Those that think the Baconian Theory stands on firm and unshakable foundations, ought no doubt to make an attempt at proving it. Scheinargumente, as we say—only confuse undisciplined minds. To convince scholars it is necessary to proceed in a scholary manner. The only possible way to convince scholars is to give satisfactory evidence stated in clear and precise language in regard to the following points.

I, Why do Baconians accept the contemporaneous attestations with reference to the authorship of the works of Marlowe, Greene, Kyd, Jonson, Fletcher, etc., and not of Shakespeare?

II. The Protocol or consensus of the debate you quote asserts that there are thousands of cöincidences between Shakespeare and Bacon. Can the Baconians mention TEN (10) convincing cöincidences, where the resemblance is truly striking and cannot be due to what we call "accident"? (speaking roughly) are there not thousands of cöincidences between Bacon and Jonson, between Bacon and Chapman, between Carlyle and Browning, between Scheller and Göethe? What do they prove?

III. In my work "Shakespeare's Books—(Berlin 1904) I have been at pains to show what books and literary productions were known to Shakespeare. Even a cursory perusal of Bacon's works would make it apparent that Bacon's library must have been a greatly different character. But Ben Jonson's works would doubtless show many more points of agreement with Bacon's. Can it therefore be doubted that Bacon wrote Jonson's and not Shakespeare's works?

IV. Can the Baconians mention ONE clear argument which undoubtedly proves Bacon's authorship of the "so-called" Shakespearean works? Or, if they have many arguments, can they give the FIVE (or, if perhaps, the SEVEN or EIGHT) best and strongest arguments. But, for mercy's sake let them not kill their opponents by verbosity, or imagine that "Scheinargumente" will settle the "Question," It would be advisable also if the Baconians give clear references when they quote a passage, giving chapter and verse in each case, to refer—not to Baconian Literature, but to the ORIGINAL works on which the Baconians are themselves dependent.

I have the honour to be, Sir—Yours very faithfully, DR. H. R.

While Dr. Anders' letter is not exactly responsive at all points, here at last, is a precise challenge! Dr. Anders has at least negatively, in his thesis

reserved to himself to decide what arguments are "convincing" and what parallelisms are "truly striking" and not "due to what may be called 'accidents.'" But, assuming that Dr. Anders will not take refuge behind any privilege or loophole of escape thus self-provided—this is the nearest approach to a convention (other than the Protocol of the Morgan-Platt Debate which Dr. Anders traverses) which NEW SHAKESPEAREANA has been able to arrange for. NEW SHAKESPEAREANA therefore respectfully invites the Hon. Edwin Reed, Dr. Isaac Hull Platt, and Mr. Basil Brown to consent to resolve themselves into a Committee which shall meet Dr. Anders' Thesis as above pronounced. Such committee to select TEN (10) convincing coincidences between Shakespeare and Bacon "which cannot be due to accidents" and NEW SHAKESPEAREANA invites its readers to address to such committee, in our care, any and all sugegstions which it may occur to any of them to make. We suggest that such committee report in sixty days from this date, (March 1, 1908), in order that the Rejoinder to Dr. Anders may be printed in the issue of NEW SHAKESPEAREANA for April 1909.

THE NEW YORK TIMES OF SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 3RD, 1905, PRINTED the following—

To the Editor—My attention is called to an article signed "Pendennis" touching Poe Park in Fordham and printed in your issue of Sunday, Aug. 20, which states that the City of New York caused "an orchard and an old mill to be destroyed to construct said park, and which winds up as follows:

"But just think of a hundred thousand dollars for a park that has destroyed all semblance of a scene that was the familiar vision—the home vista—of a great American poet!"

The facts are these: In May, 1905, at the invitation of Mr. Albert R. Frey, then a resident of Fordham, I visited with him the Poe cottage, and the idea, I suppose, occurred to us simultaneously, that the Shakespeare Society could do no more valuable work than to preserve that cottage—then threatened with demolition to make way for the widening of the historic Kingsbridge Road. On that same day I write Dr. Chauvet, its owner, and thereafter such steps were had, that in the Summer and Fall of 1895 the New York Shakespeare Society leased the Poe cottage and kept it open for public inspection and advertised the fact extensively in the New York and Boston and other city newspapers in the hope of

awakening enough public interest to secure the sum of $8,000, for which sum the owner (then as now, Dr. Chauvet) offered to sell it to us, to be furnished in as nearly as possible the guise in which it appeared during Poe's tenancy and maintained in perpetuity as a shrine, precisely as Shakespeare's birthplace is maintained at Stratford-on-Avon. The Society, however, was able to collect only a few hundred dollars, barely enough to pay for the rental and advertising, and for the cost of a banquet in the cottage itself Sunday, Sept. 22, 1895, to which the public was invited and at which the Society's plans were discussed in detail. (See the New York City dailies for Monday, Sept. 23, 1895). At that time the triangular area opposite the cottage, which is now Poe Park, was almost entirely covered with a huge pile of débris of all sorts, ten or fifteen feet high, and what was not so covered was used to store the carts and tools used in the widening of the Kingsbridge Road. I suggested to several influential residents of Fordham that this triangular space be laid out as a park and called Poe Park in honor of the cottage opposite. Several meetings in Fordham were held, and the Hon. James B. Guilden, to whom I think I had spoken among the first on the subject, was especially zealous in the matter. At his instance I drafted the bill which the Legislature passed and Governor Morton signed. I then appeared before the Park Commission, whose approval Mayor Strong desired before he would consider the bill at all, and secured its indorsement. I then went before Mayor Strong at the City Hall on the afternoon of April 23, 1896, and asked for his official approval of the bill. Here I was confronted by a body of ladies and gentlemen calling themselves, I believe, "The Authors' Guild," and they argued that our bill should be turned down in favor of a project of their own, to wit: for the city to condemn a large acreage, including the Poe cottage site, and construct a park to be called "Poets' Park," in which should be placed statues of all the American poets who were born the same year as Poe was, (at least this is my memory of their plan, and I think I am right, for I remember that one lady who was the most strenuous of all before Mayor Strong, remarked that her father was a poet, and had been born in the required year). See the afternoon dailies of April 23, 1896, and THE TIMES and other newspapers of April 24, 1896. Mayor Strong, however, signed our bill, and in due time Poe Park materialized. So much for "The Orchard and the Old Mill."

As to the "Raven" painted on the gable front of the cottage, of which your correspondent complains both as a work of art and as indicating that the poem was written therein, our friend Dr. Chauvet is responsible for

that. During the term of the Society's occupancy there was a sign which read—"THE EDGAR ALLAN POE COTTAGE, 1843—1849, LEASED BY THE NEW YORK SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY. OPEN ALWAYS TO THE PUBLIC." When the Society's lease terminated the good Doctor erased the name of the Society and employed local talent to paint in the bird. The poem was, as is well known, written in some upper room of the old frame farm house of which Poe rented a portion the year before he went to Fordham, which stood at about what is now the corner of Eighty-fourth Street and West End Avenue. I am very glad to testify to the always courteous, sympathetic, and appreciative attitude of Dr. Chauvet to forward the efforts of the New York Shakespeare Society. He could hardly be expected to make us a gift of his Fordham real estate because Poe once leased a bit of it, but he certainly did everything else that we asked him, and we have nothing but good-will for him. Nor was there any lack of zeal or effort on the part of the New York Shakespeare Society, nor of the press throughout the United States, which widely announced our plans, as was proved by the scattering communications we received from such remote points as Oregon, New Mexico, &c. A party in Alabama offered us Poe's watch (for a consideration) and a gentleman in Michigan sent us some Poe literature to put into the cottage, and so on. But what developed was that there was no appreciable interest in Poe's memory, at that date, at least, and that if a member of our Society had advanced (as he stood willing to do) the comparatively trifling amount of money required to purchase the cottage, there would have been small prospect of funds for its maintenance forthcoming. We abandoned the project with reluctance after testing public sentiment in every way. Possibly the time is fit for trying again. But I doubt it. After the hearing in Mayor Strong's office on the afternoon of April 23rd, (Shakespeare's Birthday) 1896, the Bill went back to Governor Morton: and it was with a good deal of satisfaction that I found in my mail one morning the following:—"State of New York, Executive Chamber, Albany. May 22nd, 1896. Dr. Appleton Morgan, President of the New York Shakespeare Society, Colonial Club, New York City. "Dear Sir—I beg to inform you that the so-called Poe Park Bill has been approved by the Governor, and is now chapter 537 of the Laws of 1896." Very respectfully, Ashley W. Cole, "Private Secretary."

I note "Pendennis's" conecture that Poe got the wherewithal to lease and furnish the Fordham cottage from the prize he earned by his "Gold Bug." I am afraid that the dates won't allow of this any more than

they guarantee that Old Mill. My impression is that the necessary funds were the proceeds of his libel suit against Thomas Dun English.

Yours respectfully,

APPLETON MORGAN.

New York City, Aug 27th, 1905.

Books Received

266. Aus Shakespeare's Meisterwerkstatt. Shlgeschichliche studien von George Sarrezin. 8vo., paper, pp. 226. Berlin. Druck and Verlag von George Reimer (5 marks).

272. Shakespeare, England's Ulysses: The Masque of Love's Labor Won, or the Enacted Will. Dramatised from the Sonnets of 1609 by Latham Davis. 8vo., cloth, pp. 440. New York: G. E. Stechert & Co. Portraits of Robert Devereux, Second earl of Essex.

277. Shakespeare's Church, otherwise the Collegiate Church of the Holy Trinity of Stratford-on-Avon: An architectural and Ecclesiastical History of the Fabric and its Ornaments. By J. Harvey Bloom, M. A. Illustrated by L. C. Keighly-Peach. 12mo., cloth, pp. 300. London: T. Fisher Unwin. A. Wessells Company, Brooklyn and New York.

278. The Principles of English Verse. By Charlton M. Lewis: Sanford, Professor of English in Yale University. 12mo., cloth, pp. 142. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

279. John Webster: The Periods of his Work as determined by the Relations to the Drama of his day. By Elmer Edgar Stoll, A. M., Ph. D. 8vo., paper facsimiles, pp. 210. Boston and Cambridge: The Hartford Cooperative Society.

280. Collectianea. First Series. Richard Burbage, Marlowe and Shakespeare. Ben Jonson's method of composing Verse. John Webster and Sir Philip Sianey. Edmund Spencer "Locrine" and "Selimus." The authorship of Arden of Fevershaw. By Charles Crawford. Cloth, sm, 12 mo., pp. 136. Stratford-on-Avon: The Shakespeare Head Press.

281. Collectanea. Second Series. Montaigne, Webster, Marston, Donne and Webster. The Bacon-Shakespeare Question. Cloth, sm 12mo., pp. 134. Stratford-on-Avon: The Shakespeare Head Press.

282. Beatrix of Claire. A, Romance. By John Read Scott. Illustrations in colour. 12mo., cloth, pp. 300. Philadelphia: The J. B. Lippincott Co.

284. The Seamy Side. A Story of the True Conditions of Things Theatrical. By one who has spent twenty years among them. 12mo., cloth, pp. 312. Boston: The Percy Ives Publishing Company.

274. Dramatic Traditions of the Dark Ages. By Joseph S. Tunison. 12mo., cloth, pp. 350. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

276. Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft im aufrage des vorstandes herausgegeben von Alois Brandl und Wolfgang Keller. Dreiun dvierzigster jahrgang. 8vo., cloth, pp. 492. Berlin-Schoenburg: Langensc scheidtsche verlagsbuchhandlung (Prof. G. Langenscheidt).

285. Plays of Our Forefathers and Some of the Traditions Upon Which They Were Founded. By Charles Mills Gayley, Litt. D., LL.D. With illustrations from old wood cuts, pp. 338. Price $3.50. New York: Duffield & Co.

286. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Edited by Horace Howard Furness. The Tragedie of Antonie, and Cleopatra. Imperial 8vo., cloth beveled, pp. 614. Philadelphia and London: The J. B. Lippincott Company.

287. The Ibsen Secret. A key to the Prose Dramas of Henrik Ibsen. By Jennette Lee, Professor of English Language and Literature in Smith College. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 207. New York: G. P. Putnams Sons.

288. Shakespeare Studied In Six Plays. By Hon. Albert S. G. Canning. Author of "Shakespeare Studied in Eight Plays," "History in Scott's Novels," etc. Royal 8vo., pp., enamel cloth. Philadelphia: Geo. W. Jacobs & Co.

289. The Mermaid Series. The Best Plays of The Old English Dramatists. Edited with introduction and notes. Etched frontispiece. Portraits, Twenty-five volumes. About 500 pp. each. New edition, decorated cloth, 16mo., gilt top. New York: Charles Scribners Sons.

290. As You Like It. By William Shakespeare. Edited with notes, introduction glossaries, lists of variorum readings and selected criticism. By Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke. Cloth, 16mo., pp. 178. New York: T. E. Crowell and Co.

291. Shakespeare's Christmas Gift to Queen Bess—in the year 1596. By Anna Benneson MacMahan. 12mo., pp. 70. Embossed cloth, decorated. Twenty-five engravings. Chicago: A. C. McClure & Co.

292. Shakespeare as A Dramatic Thinker. A popular illustration of fiction as the experimental side of philosophy. By Richard G. Moulton, M. A., etc. Cloth, pp. 372, 12mo. New York: The Macmillan Company.

293. The Diary of Master William Silence. A study of Shakespeare and of Elizabethan sport. By the Rt. Hon. D. H. Madden, M. A., Hon.

LL.D., Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dublin. New edition. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 400. London, New York: Bombay and Calcutta, Longmans, Green & Co.

294. Early English Dramatists. Lost Tudor Plays, with Some Others. Edited by John S. Farmer. Privately Printed by the Early English Drama Society, 18 Bury Street, Bloomsbury, W. C.

277. The Truth Concerning Stratford-upon-Avon and Shakespeare, and Other Essays. By Edwin Reed. 8vo., boards, pp. 61. Boston: Coburn Publishing Company.

295. French Men of Letters Series. Edited by Alexander Jessup, L. H. D. Francoes Rabelais. By Arthur Tilley, M. A. 12mo., cloth, pp. 388, with portrait. Philadelphia and London: The J. B. Lippincott Company.

296. Vers de Societé Authology, collected by Carolyn Welles. 5½ x 7½ in. Cloth, pp. 357. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

272. The Sonnets have been twisted, rearranged, interpreted to mean anything and everything, and hocussed out of the only shape in which their author left them over and over again! Mr. Latham Davis is no less privileged than another to make what he can out of them, and he has conceived them as the dialogue of a masque, and that masque, the missing "Loves Labours Won." The idea is capital and clever; and if Mr. Davis had himself been contented with it, his volume would have been a pleasant one. Unfortunately, however, he has interstrewn his letterpress with fantastic, bizzare and more or less puzzling title and half-title pages in Emblem (after the archaic usage, perhaps) and cryptographic mottoes, until it is spoiled completely for any consecutive reading at all! If Mr. Davis will take out all this occult rubbish, and present the text of the sonnets arranged as dialogue between the character selected (Nature, Beauty, Time, Rarity, Wonder, Desire, etc.), and the author of the Sonnets themselves; (Mr. Davis says these authors were Essex, Bacon and others, (and Mr. Davis has a perfect right to assert this, since the sonnets are as they stand anonymous), the book will be quite as readable as almost any other of the books which come to confuse us as to these remarkable Poems!

277. Mr. Bloom's "Shakespeare's Church—An Architectural and Ecclesiastical History," published in this country by the A. Wessells Company, is the only one of the numberless books and monographs devoted to descriptive of the Collegiate Church of Stratford—Holy Trinity, which leaves nothing wanting or to be desired. It is specific—exhaustively comprehensive

and absolutely itemized to cover every possible particular. The tourist who has this book in his satchel can ask no question not answered there, with a perfect Index to anticipate his search. And it should, preferentially to all the others, find place on the book stacks of every consulting library.

279. Professor Stoll has done for Webster, what so many of our college professors and university men are doing for the Elizabethan Dramatists. Inasmuch as they are all illustrative of Shakespeare—and that the study of Shakespeare embraces properly a study of them all—all these are valuable. We commend Professor Stoll's as the standard and to date study of this distinguished Co-Dramatist. Professor Stoll has particularly italicised Webster as a thinker and a serious exponent of tendencies, other than Dramatic—of his day. Especially in the initial chapter the learned author "hopes that he has done something" in a negative way—to prove that the dramatist was not the John Webster, clockworker, who made his Will and died in 1625 nor a tailor at all. The work in over two hundred compactly printed pages has no space for esthetic criticism (which is as a rule easy writing and tedious reading), but is paragraphic—almost encyclopædic in form. It forms a work of reference, out of which half a hundred other books on Webster might be written. It is in every way a model of what such a volume should be.

282. Somehow or other this is a readable novel—even if it does fall into the "swash-buckler" style of fiction. Its exploitation of that splendid statesman and soldier, Richard the Third, the fosterer of young ambition —bringer together of young lovers—the generous dispenser of all lovely and beautiful things—whose life was a sunburst and whose only impulse was to see everybody around him happy, is timely and interesting.

284. "The Seamy Side." This book will be widely read as an exhibit in the endless discussion: Is the profession of the Actor a moral or an immoral one. It is probably a true statement, a plain unvarnished tale, otherwise it would probably have been far worse or far better. But in all human charity let it be asked if the Stage is the only human institution that has a Seamy Side? Harrison Grey Fiske, Esq., who for a quarter of a century has stood (not always without sacrifice) in New York City for all that was and is cleanest, highest and best in Stage and Theatre, lately delivered an address before the New York Three Arts Club. And the temptation to reproduce every word of his address in the pages of NEW SHAKESPEAREANA is all but irresistible. For it is especially difficult, from its compact and pregnant context, to select a passage more quotable than the rest of it. But as foreclosing this question of The Seamy Side of the

theatrical life, we reprint this much of it: "We hear much about the 'temptations' of the actress' life. An intimate association with the theatre covering more than twenty-five years has revealed to me no confirmation of them as they are vividly pictured by good people who have no personal knowledge of the stage. And when I say the stage I do not mean to include a class of entertainments frequently given on our boards which mostly consists of inane twaddle, poor music, the exhibition of stupid women, and the antics of silly clowns. Where mere feminine display is the real point of attraction there are bred the evils which are erroneously attributed to the followers of the dramatic profession. It is a libel upon a beautiful art and of its earnest votaries, to give these purveyors of frivolity the name of actresses. The people of the stage are neither better nor worse that the people in other occupations. The nomadic life in some cases may have a demoralizing effect upon the speech and manners of men and women; but innate refinement like innate virtue, is not subject to variation because of external circumstances. There is no more temptation to an honest woman to be otherwise in one place or in another. We all know that opportunity to forget the duties of life exists everywhere—no more and no less in the theatre than elsewhere. The wolf seeking whom he may devour lurks outside the factory, the office and on the street corner just as frequently as he haunts the slandered stage-door. Year in and year out I have seen plainly dressed women hurrying out of the stage-door after the performance, intent only on an hour of study, or a fitful sleep before the early start for the next stand in the gray dawn; or, pale and exhausted from an all-day rehearsal, snatching a bite at a neighboring restaurant and reporting for the evening performance; performing double work on holidays when other people are enjoying a festival; or otherwise engaged in the busy routine of the theatrical life. There is little chance for 'temptation' to show its head there. And suppose it did? The woman of the stage would meet it precisely as the woman who earns her living in other ways meets it."

290. Place aux Dames! We have always lovingly refrained from criticising too deeply Shakespeare's only editresses—and the "First Folio Shakespeare," however incongruously combining the vest pocket form beloved of theatre goers attending a Shakespeare play—with the Archaic text to which the modern eye was unaccustomed—had so many gentle features that even strenuous comment seemed to be disarmed. But when (as we indeed have already once pointed out) this edition is employed by the editresses to exploit their personal friendships—are we not a bit justified in cautioning its edi-

tresses. In the Loves Labours Lost we noted that these ladies stated that the incident of the princess of France and the King of Navarre, upon which that play was founded, was discovered "by Dr. Sidney Lee." (It was discovered by Mr. Joseph Hunter in 1846, (about the time that Mr. Lee was born!) For the present play the ladies discuss the late discovery of the Earl of Rutland "impresio"—again discovered by Dr. Sidney Lee. Why not say that the impresso was discovered—as it happens to have been—by Sir Henry Maxwell Lyte. Another criticism might be that the claim of the editresses that this edition uses the first folio text must not be examined too closely. Except that, barring exceptions, the Orthography of the First Folio is followed—there is very little if any resemblance. The first folio by using the long s—and v for u and u for v—is a very different matter. And are not the ladies a bit fantastic, in assuring that Jaques's speech, "all the world's a stage," etc., was an allusion to the motto of the Globe Theatre, built in 1599, "Totus mundus agit histrionem." These editors assume that both the motto and the speech "arose at the same time from the same mind—Shakespeare's." They argue, therefore, that the date of the composition of "As You Like It" was 1599. This is, of course, "commentary," as commentary goes. What its value may be, however, is quite another matter.

285. Dr. Gayley has produced in this book, "Plays of Our Forefathers," a new and invaluable work. In substance it is an amplification to his well known and already standard "Representative English Comedies." The work arranges itself to find the ultimate beginning of Dramatic Expression in celebrations of religious or civic feast days the introduction into church services of dramatic chants and processionals. "It was not until the Church of the Dark Ages had begun to emphasize in its religious functions the dramatic element lying at the core of its ritual and its faith, and to realize that the latter could be best inculcated by dramatizing the former—the faith emphasized by staging the ritual—it was not until then that the modern drama was born." From the dramatic chant within the edifice grew the idea of a spectacle or pageant outside upon a raised platform, and this, says Dr. Gayley, is the first step of the evolution—the first separation of the Drama from Religious ceremonial. "Once the idea of impressing the public mind by means of dramatic representations, with the significance of the church ritual had taken root," declares Dr. Gayley, "its branching and flowering were but a question of opportunity and constructive imagination. The opportunity was at hand in the succession of holy days appointed to be observed by the ecclesiastical calendar." The four Sundays in Advent * * * which offered alluring material for dramatic treatment; e. g., Christ riding into Jerusalem upon the ass

and cleansing the temple of its money changers; the healing of the lepers and the restoring of sight to the blind; the ministry of John bearing witness, and of Elijah and the Prophets; the mystery of the second coming, the parable of the Virgins, wise and foolish, with its thrilling cry, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh!" the rehearsal of the signs that shall precede the last judgment, and the lurid history of the Man of Sin; the Antichrist whose name and threatened reign were facts that gripped the mediæval heart with dread * * * afforded in themselves varied fabric for literary or processional commemoration." All these preluded the miracle drama of the Middle Ages, which came next in step of evolution. Balaam's ass is responsible for the invasion of the humorous element into the early drama. The entrance at church pageants of the historic little animal excited the middle century risibles, and "thenceforward he was destined to play sad havoc with certain sacred festivals in which at first he had played an innocent and even laudable part—he began with Balaam and the procession of Prophets, proceeded with the Magi, and then with the Virgin, who unwarily rode him into Egypt."

Real priests appeared in a play called "The Coronation of the Virgin," the cooks of the town were called upon to take part in "The Cooks' Pageant," a piece which was also known as "The Harrying of Hell," and which was acted by the cooks because they were "in the habit of taking things out of the fire"! Read here, ye modern players, what things it were necessary a man should learn ere he could get an engagement in the genuine "palmy days". "In York a certain humorous affinity of guild and play leaps to the eye, as when the Shipwrights devote themselves to 'The Construction of the Ark,' the Fishmongers to 'The Flood,' the chandlers to 'The Shepherds and the Star,' the goldcrafts to 'The Three Kings,' the nailers and sawyers to the 'Massacre of the Innocents,' and the barbers to the 'Baptism of the Saviour.' The requirements were literal. In 1452 "five fishers were made to put down eight shillings each for not playing their play on Corpus Christi Day in spite of the proclamation by the common bellman," and were ordered to have the pageants ready by Palm Sunday next. In the same year ordered "Henry Cowper, a weaver, to pay a fine of six shillings and eightpence for forgetting his lines on the same feast day of Corpus Christi." Henry had but fourpence to pay, so they took it and warned him to report for rehearsal at 10:30 next morning. Richard Trollopp was made to pay a heavy sum because the actors in his play, "The Three Kings of Cologne," gave an indifferent performance.

Says Dr. Gayley: "The manner of these plays were, every company had his pageant or part, which pageants were a high scaffold with two

rooms, a higher and a lower, upon four wheels. In the lower they appareled themselves, and in the higher room they played, being all open on top, that all beholders might hear and see them. "Pater Coelestis with his attendant angels," occupied the uppermost. The saints were placed in the next tier, and human beings filled the bottom tier. From Hellmouth came the noise of supernumeraries playing the lost souls.

"To making one new Hell-head, 8s. 2d.," "six skins of white leather for God's garment," in the miracle play of "The Crucifixion," cost 18d. The making of the same garment is put down as 10d., and the making of a wig for God and the sewing of his coat of leather, are listed respectively at 12d. For a girdle for God, 3d. For painting Herod's face, (mask?) 10d. "For mending of Herod's head and a mitre and other things, 2s." For Pilot's wife, "for mending of Dame Percula's garments, 7d." To reward Mistress Grimsby "for lending of her gear for Pilot's wife, 12d."

We have no space to fully abridge this fine work, but must pass rapidly to the establishment of the first permanent theatre in Paris by the effort of a society of craftsmen known as the "Confrerie de la Passion," "for they played within doors and in fixed place—first l'Hopital de la Trinite, then l'Hotel de Flanders, and finally l'Hotel de Bourgogne, from their inception until the close of the sixteenth century." Gayley here institutes a comparison between English and French "mysteries and morals."

292. This is another twang on the old strings. Its title is the one selected by Dr. Moulton for divers rambling remarks upon Shakespeare: Esthetic, internal, external, and—one is tempted to say—eternal! There is no particular reason why these remarks should be made—nor to be frank, any particular reason why they should not be made. But that, if the book should happen to fall into the hands of a novice, the novice would be able to arrive at any definite conception of what it was all about, probably Dr. Moulton himself would not expect. To be told that Lear "is a play, in which the problem takes the form of a disturbed equilibrium in the moral world, working out to a position of rest (page 143) would not suggest to an enquirer that "Lear" was a play written for presentation in a theatre, and doubtless it is just as well that it should not. To follow the page down and to be told that the reason why Shakespeare introduces prostitutes and brothels into his plays was a proviso in the Institutional Ethics, would be a still further bewilderment. The book is a flux of words.

288. This is for the most part sign-post criticism pure and simple—being a running transcript of the play—in narrative—using Shakespeare's every salient word. And if one is to have purely internal commentary at

all, this seems the best, if only because, being purely objective, there is no danger of being misled to accept as Shakespeare the commentator instead of Shakespeare himself. Mr. Canning's prefatory note that his work is intended for the general reader and not for the Shakespeare scholar, disarms criticism, or would disarm it, were there any criticism to be offered. There is a lock of fascination in reading the plays over again, for their narrative merely in Mr. Canning's pages. And when, as in the case of King John and Macbeth, Mr. Canning permits himself to leave the text and seek for inoperative sources, his work becomes of some value to the external student.

289. The Mermaid Series of Old English Plays is now the exclusive standard of the scholar and General Reader. The introductions are in each case by such special students as Swinburne, Ward, Ellis, Symonds, Verity, Saulsbury and others. The notes are efficient and sufficient, and the excellent letterpress upon thin paper make the volumes delightful in port and facility. Nothing further could be imagined or desired, and the completeness of the collection insures the possessor thereof that he has all that can equip his library with the work of Shakespeare's contemporaries and immediate successors in the English Drama.

289. The Early English Dramatic Society is re-issuing these Dramatic pieces from 1550 onwards. The pedantic binding—blue boards with ribbed-white parchment backs, and the beautiful paper and brilliant and clear lined type are a benison to the reader's eye. The library that obtains a full set of this reprint is very fortunate, and need not look for further improvement in a presentation of the pre-Shakespearean English Drama. A special interest lies in the fact that this edition contains three plays belonging to the Tudor Period which were only recovered a year ago. They were contained in a quarto volume unearthed in an old Irish house, which, to the surprise of their owner, fetched £2600 under the hammer of a London auctioneer, Mr. Bernard Quaritch being the purchaser. The whole lot consisted of seventeen pre-Shakespearean interludes, of which three, now reproduced for the first time, were totally unknown—*Wealth and Health, Impatient Poverty,* and *John the Evangelist* —four were apparently unknown or unrecorded editions, and the other ten valuable examples of editions of which there are other copies in existence. *Mankind,* a morality (c. 1475) portraying the life of ne'er-do-weels in late Plantagenet and early Tudor times; *Nature,* an interlude written by Henry Medwall, chaplain to John Morton, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury; the play of *Wit and Science,* by John Redford, a musician who was organist at

St. Paul's about 1535; and *Republica* (A. D. 1553), a drama of real life in the early days of Queen Mary, are other plays included.

277. While this work will not, perhaps, add to Mr. Reed's reputation, it is a clearing up of his workshop and an amplification of several points left open. Its especial value strikes us as being an exact statement of the pedigree of the tenement or curtilage now called "The Birthplace." So far as we remember there is not elsewhere extant so complete a statement. Like all Mr. Reed's work it is exact and without superfluous word or phrase, that is to say, with true Baconian sense of the phrase—it is achromatic, as without alternative as a propostion in Euclid.

291. This is a charming conceit and will make a proper Christmas present to a dainty lady. Shakespeare's Christmas gift to Queen Bess is the play The Midsummer Night's Dream. The first part of the book is concerned with a discussion of the play by the wits of the Mermaid. The second recounts the presentation of the play itself before the Queen and her lordly court and cabinet. Our fingers dusty with pulling over authorities must beware how they touch such exquisite book making as this. Smug commentators have nothing to do with fancy work like this. And most of all as we peep between its pages, do we reflect that all our criticism, textual, Higher, Destructive or whatever one likes, has never yet, and never will disturb the glamour of Shakespeare, the poet, the lover, the greatest and sweetest of all!

* * *

***The Editors cannot undertake to return unused manuscript, though they will endeavor to do so if self-directed, stamped envelope is enclosed therewith.

All manuscripts submitted *must be type-written.*

Address all matters intended for The Editors, Books for Review, etc., NEW SHAKESPEAREANA, P. O. Box, 617, WESTFIELD, NEW JERSEY.